DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 320 SP 010 357

AUTHOR Mulhern, John D.
TITLE An Overview of Teachers' Centres in England and Wales.
PUB DATE May 76
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at Teacher Centering: A National Symposium (Washington, D.C., May 23-26, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; *Educational Coordination; Educational Development; Educational Planning; Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Professional Continuing Education; Resource Centers; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Education; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *England; *Wales

ABSTRACT

Teachers' centers have been established in England and Wales for the purpose of curriculum development and inservice teacher education. The philosophical basis for the centers are the principles that the motive power in curriculum development should come primarily from local groups of teachers accessible to each other and that there should be effective and close collaboration between teachers and all those who are able to offer cooperation. The centers are controlled by teachers and supported by local tax money. The report highlights the current status and organization of teachers' centers at Cheshire, Cornwall, and Surrey; the stated purpose of the centers; and the types of centers. The future direction of the centers is discussed in light of the recommendations made by a Committee of Inquiry into Teacher Education and Training (the James Report) and an official government White Paper. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED127320

AN OVERVIEW OF TEACHERS' CENTRES IN ENGLAND AND WALES

BY
DR. JOHN D. MULHERN
DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A PAPER PRESENTED AT:
TEACHER CENTERING: A NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MAY 23-26, 1976

SP 010 357

TEACHERS' CENTERS IN ENGLAND AND WALES

> "One way of overcoming the staleness and mindless conservation that results when schools refuse to examine, reflect upon and appraise the societies in which they are functioning is to introduce a universal programme of in-service education."[1]

Curriculum development and in-service education are the "raison d'etre" of the teachers' centres as they have been established and now function in England and Wales. Both functions are closely interwoven and interdependent up to a point but the general feeling that one encounters in many centres is that the directors devote their energies to the in-service program and that curriculum development is a phenomenon that may result. However, teachers' centres are part of the local educational scene in a big way and the Schools Council lists a total of 482 in England and 50 in Wales as of May, 1973.[2] The centres are youthful and vital institutions with enviable growth and support and yet there are visible signs that seem to cloud their future and raise questions about their survival, at least in their present form. The charge to the centres is generally clear, the potential for success is generally present and ample evidence of success does exist and yet they will probably be gone, or radically different, before the decade turns.

Early Development

Teachers' centres appeared on the educational scene as a forceful institution for change during the 1960's even though a number of them were established during the late 1940's as a result of the Education Act of 1944.[3] Their development and growth has been the result of a joint effort by the Department of

Education and Science and the Schools Council and has been strongly influenced by the publication of "Circular Number 7/64"[4] by the DES and "Working Paper 2"[5] by the Schools Council. In the first, the Department indicated a need to explore and develop the established arrangements for the further training of serving teachers and the usefulness of establishing more local study centres and facilities for individual work by teachers. The Schools Council, in one of its first efforts after its establishment in 1964, drew professional attention to the need for a thorough re-evaluation of the secondary school curriculum in preparation for raising the school leaving age from 15 to 16. In anticipation of the impact of "Raising the School Leaving Age," the Council recommended the development of centres in which the professional aim would be a study of the major areas of the curriculum by local teachers with some outside assistance to be followed by the preparation of new courses. At the same time, the Council seconded a small number of teachers as field officers who were placed in charge of large areas of England and Wales having special responsibility for promoting teachers' centres. By 1968 the Council reported the existence of 300 centres and by 1970 it reported the number as over 500. Growth has slowed since the rapid development between 1965-1970 as reassessment and reappraisal of the centres and teacher education generally takes place as a result of the James Report[6] and the subsequent release of the Government White Paper.[7]

Many of the centres established during the period from 1964 were special purpose centres and were involved in national curriculum projects, i.e. Nuffield Mathematics, Northwest Curriculum Project, etc. These early centres were highly specialized and were designed to meet the needs of teachers and schools working in the project. With the publication in 1967 of "Working Paper, No. 10"[8]

by the Schools Council, the development of multi-purpose centres was accelerated. In it, the Council put forth two basic principles upon which curriculum development should be built: first, the motive power should come primarily from local groups of teachers accessible one to another; second, that there should be effective and close collaboration between teachers and all those who are able to offer cooperation. This provided the philosophical basis for the establishment of local curriculum centres controlled by teachers and supported by local tax monies. Consequently, new centres were established and some existing centres were re-oriented to become multi-purpose centres. Thornbury identifies thirteen reasons why the centres developed; among them:

> ... the need for a social and recreational centre
>
> ... the high staff turnover in rundown urban areas
>
> ... the failure of colleges of education to prepare teachers adequately for the classroom; dissatisfaction with in-service courses; the need for crash courses, etc.
>
> ... the need to modernize the curriculum especially in mathematics and science[9]

In response to a questionnaire administered in 1968, the Schools Council reports:

> "Control of the centres was, in the main, firmly in the hands of teachers. On management committees they outnumbered local education authority officials and education committee representatives in the ratio of 5-2. In forty-five centres there were no management committees, but most of these were single subject centres which came directly under the control of local education authority advisers.
>
> The usual programme was a combination of work related to national projects, courses arranged by local education authority advisers, and curriculum study groups established by teachers. Only in a minority of centres was it clear from the returns that study groups had developed to the stage of systematic local curriculum development. The activities involved primary and

secondary teachers, with many centres encouraging overlapping programmes."[10]

It may be seen that within a five to six year span of time, teachers' centres were firmly established as part of the local schools and that teachers were clearly voting for them with their feet. It seems incredulous, in many ways, that a structure designed to promote curriculum change could be so firmly established in such a short period of time. It is becoming increasingly obvious that traditional barriers to sweeping curriculum reform i.e. the safeguarding of traditional institutional primacy in certain areas, a reluctance on the part of teachers to undergo the personal and professional changes necessary to effect permanent change, the traditional opposition to planned change, etc., were not truly resolved in the establishment of the centres but merely brushed aside by the momentum of the movement. The ability of the centre leadership to deal with these problems will, in the long run, determine the longevity of the centres.

Current Status and Organization of Teachers' Centres

The reorganization of local government units in England and Wales took place on April 1, 1974. The reduction from 123 to 83 governmental units also means there are not 83 local educational authorities. The ways in which teachers' centres are organized within each authority varies as greatly as do the differences among state and local authorities within the United States. However, there are some common characteristics which one finds in most of the centres such as a small management committee to advise or direct the warden, as the centre leader is called.

The Schools' Council reports:

> "Apart from the need for the management committee, the experience of many centres indicated the need for two other organizational procedures. The first was a larger meeting of all those interested in the work of the centre, partly to spread news of developments but even more to ensure the widest participation and degree of democratic control. The second procedure was to ensure that the various study or working groups were represented in central discussions."[11]

In order to illustrate the similarities as well as the differences in the way the local educational authorities are organized for teachers' centres, three authorities--Cheshire, Cornwall and Surrey--are analyzed in the following section. Cheshire is located in the West Midlands, south of Manchester and east of Liverpool. It includes some of the older sections of the industrial midlands as well as pastoral areas. Cornwall, located on the southwest coast of England is noted for its independent population and is ancestral home of many of the American colonists. It is a rural area with one of the lightest percentages of humans per acre in England. Surrey is suburban London and the London Authority took a sizeable portion of its territory on April 1, 1974. A large area, it has population centres which are widely separated from each other. The three authorities deal with all but the largest population centres and incorporate a range of organizational patterns which seem to cover just about every other schema in England and Wales.

CHESHIRE has eight teachers' centres located throughout the 'shire under the administrative responsibility of the director for teacher training.[12] There is an authority-wide committee known as the Professional Coordinating Committee consisting of ten teachers and ten others including three college representatives and five inspectors or supervisors with the members appointed triennially. The Committee meets once each term to:

1. Plan and provide for the development of teachers' centres within the county.

2. Receive reports of the work of the teachers' centres within the county.

3. Coordinate the work of the several teachers' centres to obtain the best use of the available resources.

4. Consider and keep under review the constitution of the Local Steering Committee of the teachers' centres.

5. Relate the work of the teachers' centres, so far as practicable, to the general program of in-service training for teachers and youth leaders.

Each local teachers' centre functions with a warden nominated for appointment by a local steering committee consisting of twelve members: 2 Representatives of the Professional Coordinating Committee, 2 primary teachers, 2 secondary teachers, 2 college representatives and 4 education authority personnel. Its functions are defined as:

1. To decide the program of work to be undertaken by the centre in each academic year.

2. To consider reports from the warden on the work of the centre.

3. To submit reports on the work of the centre for the consideration of the Professional Coordinating Committee.

4. To consider and make recommendations on matters referred to it by the County Education Authority or by the Professional Coordinating Committee.

5. To make recommendations to the Professional Coordinating Committee on other matters within the competence of the Professional Coordinating Committee.

6. To decide items of expenditure, within the annual sum approved by the County Education Authority in connection with the normal operation of the centre.

7. To make recommendations concerning in-service training in the area served by the Centre and arising from the activities of the Centre.

8. To determine, subject to the overall control of the County Education Authority, the use of the premises.

9. To appoint clerical and domestic staff within the limits of expenditure approved by the County Education Authority.

CORNWALL has been described by Roseveare[13] as having a two-tier organization in the operation of fourteen teachers' centres including a residential centre. A county-wide Central Academic Board serves as the coordinating unit for the centres. Board members include one teacher representative from each of the fourteen centres, the local H.M.I. (Department of Education and Science Inspector), three college representatives, three county authority representatives and three wardens with voting membership resting soiely with the teacher members. Policy recommendations are passed to a small working party of Education Committee members and teachers. This working party, in turn, makes recommendations to the Further Education Committee which, in turn, refurs them to the Education Committee.

Each local teachers' centre is governed by a Local Academic Board consisting of twelve teachers, six primary and six secondary. This board may recommend agenda items to the Central Academic Board and one of its members serves on that Board. The main function of the centres is on in-service courses and there is no positive leadership in curriculum development. In fact, Roseveare suggests[14] that the wardens are prevented from doing so by the terms of their contracts and that authority staff and Local Academic Boards preclude the centres from assuming an advisory or inspectorial role and in that way effectively curtail any meaningful curriculum role.

SURREY has established the Surrey Schools Council as a means to facilitate teacher-with-teacher communication and work on curriculum matters.[15] The Council preceded the formation of the teachers' centres so it was only natural

to assign that task to it. The twelve teacher members are appointed for a three-year term from a list of nominations made by the teachers' associations and the Inspectorate. Its sole function is to make recommendations to the Education Committee on matters concerning teacher involvement and needs in connection with curriculum study, planning, development, assessment, etc. The Council is presently working in five areas:

1. Teachers' Curriculum Study Centres
2. The Certificate of Secondary Education and other developments in teacher-controlled examinations.
3. County participation in national projects, especially Schools Council projects, and dissemination of curriculum development projects.
4. Assistance to teachers groups and schools developing curriculum.
5. Curriculum information services.

The Council has established ten centres and it assumed control over a residential centre. With a single exception, they operate with a part-time warden and are meant to be places where teachers meet to study and exchange and develop curriculum ideas informally with other teachers. The secretary to the Council is a seconded County Inspector who is also in charge of in-service education.

Status is complex to measure and the status of teachers' centres is even more difficult because of the subtleness of many of the pressures on teachers. However, given a relatively pressure-free situation to attend a class or simply visit a teachers' centre conducted by a non-status figure does give some indication of something other than mere availability. The figures presented in Table 1 indicate an increase of over 100% in the total number of courses offered in Surrey, rising from 47 during Spring, 1972, to 95 during Autumn, 1973. Each theme area also shows a marked increase in the number of courses from Spring, 1972, to Autumn, 1973.

TABLE 1
GROWTH AND DISTRIBUTION OF IN-SERVICE COURSES OFFERED IN SURREY TEACHERS' CENTRES, 1972 and 1973.[16]

TERM AND YEAR	TOTAL NO. OF COURSES	THEME		
		RECREATIONAL[a]	CURRICULUM DISSEMINATION[b]	SELF IMPROVEMENT[c]
SPRING, 1972	47	0	34	13
AUTUMN, 1973	95	9	44	42

a Recreational includes courses such as guitar, pottery, etc. which are non curriculum related.

b Curriculum dissemination includes all curriculum study groups and projects.

c Self improvement includes teaching techniques and the use of A.V. software and hardware and discussion groups that are generally broadening and classroom related.

The figures presented in Table 2 give some indication of the teacher use of the Stockport (near Manchester) Centre. This report is given in terms of the number of hours spent by teachers at the Centre itself. From a total of 4524 teacher hours spent in organized curriculum development, courses and teacher group sessions in 1967-68, the total has grown to 17,10 teacher hours in 1972-73, a four-fold increase in just six years. In addition, the Centre has issued thirteen reports ranging from "Social Studies in Secondary Schools (1969)" to "Community Education in Secondary Schools (1973)."

Greenwood summarizes the problems of organization and status succinctly when he states:

> "I am still of the opinion that the teachers' centre is a concept, not an institution, and that we should be looking to see what is happening in schools as a measure of success rather than counting heads through doors of centres. The warden, centre leader, call him what you will, is no longer a teacher; at the same time, however, he ought not be perceived by teachers as being someone from 'the office.'"[18]

Purpose

To assume that clearly defined purposes exist for any institution such as teachers' centres whose development has been so swift and whose sponsorship consists of over 100 local education agencies spurred on by the two most powerful structures within English education is simply unrealistic. However, it is amazing that one finds as much agreement among teachers' centres nationally as the evidence seems to support. It may simply be due to the newness of the centres and the fact that there has not been enough time for each centre to "spread its wings" and be itself rather than a place which still looks to the Schools' Council for short-time and long-term guidance. On the other hand, the similarity of purposes may be due to the fact that the centre personnel have clearly conceptualized

TABLE 2

REPORT OF USE OF STOCKPORT TEACHERS' CENTRE,
SEPTEMBER, 1967 to DECEMBER, 1973.[17]

YEAR	TERM	COURSES AND ORGANIZED ACTIVITIES		TEACHERS' GROUPS	TOTAL
		Secondary Curriculum Development	Courses		
1967	Autumn	535*	100	308	943
1968	Spring	798	884	263	1945
	Summer	58	1111	467	1636
	Autumn	394	1629	326	2349
1969	Spring	502	1827	425	2754
	Summer	518	1110	549	2177
	Autumn	686	2318	1117	4121
1970	Spring	645	2520	1358	4523
	Summer	378	2133	499	3010
	Autumn	2026	2742	1070	5838
1971	Spring	1626	3517	669	5812
	Summer	2029	2076	1124	5229
	Autumn	1336	3555	926	5817
1972	Spring	1074	1953	1023	4050
	Summer	1324	3350	1234	5908
	Autumn	1225	3207	1431	5863
1973	Spring	1112	3069	2902	7083
	Summer	860	1702	2022	4664
	Autumn	205	4024	2226	6456

Annutal Totals:	
1967-68	4524
1968-69	7280
1969-70	11654
1970-71	16879
1971-72	15775
1972-73	17610

*Figures are given by the number of teacher hours involved.

the need for the centre and are determined to meet it.

In the literature, in district statements and in the stated purposes of most individual centres themselves, curriculum development is clearly established as the primary purpose of the teachers' centres.[19, 20] The confusion, if there is any, seems to be in semantic differences and the interpretation of what constitutes curriculum development. The provision of a host of services including audio-visual software and hardware, curriculum kits, in-service courses and a "comfort centre" may be desirable and, in fact, essential support services for the smooth functioning of a modern curriculum, but do they constitute curriculum development? The provision of courses for teachers which are designed to familiarize the teachers with new programs, content and methods are part of the curriculum function; but, again, does this constitute development even though it may be unrealistic for some districts to proceed beyond this stage of the curriculum process. The formation of teacher study groups engaged in a systematic study of the district curriculum and the development of local guides, programs and units is generally recognized by most educators as "curriculum development; but, who should have responsibility for authorizing such groups? Local districts typically maintain a "curriculum" unit as part of the administrative control segment of the district in which is vested the development, inspectorial and consultancy functions of the curriculum. It is difficult to imagine this vested interest group as willingly turning over a major part of their responsibility to a teachers' centre as they would then have responsibility for the implementation of a curriculum over which they had little or no input or control. The dilemma is clear enough and the extent to which each force has accommodated the other and compromised traditional roles and functions determines, to a great extent, the actual role of each teachers'

centre in curriculum development.

Goals and the means to attain those goals may be seen as being predetermined for each centre in the milieu of the real world which is a political one. In a district where a centre is viewed as a threat to the traditional network in curriculum development, the centre typically operates without the authority to initiate curriculum study groups and is, thereby, excluded from development work. On the other hand, where traditional networks do not exist, or where teachers' centres are viewed as another vehicle to aid in improving the curriculum, centres function as an integral part of the curriculum process including development.

It is not surprising, then, to find centres whose stated purpose is curriculum development and, yet, the activities of the centre do not include curriculum development. In order to justify its existence, it will offer a variety of activities, some of which may be curriculum related. Illustrative of this situation is a statement by Kahn:

> "...for a centre to succeed in attracting local teachers and involve them in the work of the centre, it must provide a service for teachers which meets their real needs. This could manifest itself in a number of ways--free materials; availability of reprographic services; exhibitions; newsletter; information about courses; etc."[21]

At the same time that the Schools Council cites[22] the need for placing greater stress on local centres as places which encourage and facilitate a whole range of curriculum development characterized by its origin in teachers' exchanges on objectives and by learning activities designed by teachers, it states:

> "Two specialist areas appeared to have priority on the list of most centres: one was separate provision for audio-visual equipment; the other was for a working library."[23]

In a survey conducted by the National Union of Teachers, the results were equally inconclusive with respect to the curriculum development role. In the report it is stated that wardens viewed the exchange and development of ideas as being the first function of the centre and curriculum development as a key function. It goes on to state with respect to curriculum development:

> "One reason for the establishment of teachers' centres was to enable programmes of curriculum development to be developed. Some centres and authorities were criticized in the survey for little or no involvement in this field. One comment advocated that the warden's role should be that of an innovator--that he should be taking the lead in this field. The comment that curriculum development was not handled in a sufficiently positive way as made several times. Lack of experience in dealing with the group situation, and lack of training were advanced as reasons for this situation."[24]

It is entirely possible that some of the confusion on curriculum development is related to the early stages of the movement when centres were established initially as part of a curriculum project and they had a key role in development, whereas, the later ones were not part of a curriculum project. By 1970 when the Schools Council published Pamphlet No. 6, it is evident that role conflict existed. This was manifest in two ways. First,[25] the Council re-emphasizes the need to organize teacher groups to review existing local curricula and encourage them to bring about change. At the same time, it states that although the functions of serving as a base for national projects and as a base for in-service training are important, they are not, of themselves, a reason for establishing a teachers' centre. Second,[26] that the centre should not aim at providing a total advisory service and that the centre warden should not become an adviser (curriculum supervisor) because it might prevent the very relationship of trust that the centre should foster. However, curriculum development does exist in many centres.[27] The Bury Teachers' Centre, which has received national prominence for its work,

lists its objectives as:

1. To develop locally new materials and techniques.
2. To enable teachers to exchange ideas and experiences with colleagues.
3. To evaluate and criticize new materials a techniques developed regionally and nationally.
4. To provide in-service courses to meet the needs of teachers locally.
5. To act as a resource centre.[28]

To the contrary, in a review of the Cheshire Teachers' Centres,[29] not one of the eight wardens cited curriculum development in the accepted sense as among the activities at their centres. Although two centre wardens present a generalized curriculum model in their report, there is nothing to suggest that it is other than simply a discussion. Lastly, it is interesting to note than an "aide-memoire" used by some of the inspectors from the Department of Education and Science (see Appendix 2) fails to get at the critical questions pertaining to the "who" and "how" of the development of the centre objectives or the extent to which they are attained.

Statements of goals and objectives and the means of attaining them are traditionally an area of misunderstanding and confusion in education. It is not surprising, therefore, to note that teachers' centres similar to other segments of the educational enterprise suffer from the ills of poorly conceived goals and the means to attain them. It is surprising, however, that there is as much unity of purpose among so many centres, most of which are administratively responsive to councils of local teachers. Ideologically, the centres need to develop a full range of advisory and consultancy services to be really forceful in curriculum development and, yet, to do so would probably place them in conflict with their teacher

clientele and the district curriculum leadership. Failing in this, it is not unexpected to see centres branch out into other curriculum-related activities and non-related activities.

Types of Centers

In general, the teachers' centres may be classified in several different ways in order to account for the great variety among them. For instance, there are considerable differences between the urban centres and the rural centres including level of support, housing and the level of acceptance; and by the same token, there is as much difference among urban centres and among rural centres as there is between them. Similarly, one might differentiate between centres in which the teachers really held control and those in which the district really held control and, again, the differences among each type seem as great as those between them. The simplest classification seems to be the most readily defensible; so, the centres are classified as residential, college and/or university-related and district non-residential. Further, some attention must be given to centres as being subject centres or multi-purpose. Although the vast majority of the centres are multi-purpose in that they don't restrict themselves to a single subject, a number of the single subject centres continue to exist, particularly in the urban areas where a district is likely to sponsor both types. Additionally, some of the college/university related centres are single subject centres.

The Inner London Educational Authority, as the largest school district in the Country, is due special recognition as it maintains a total of forty-two centres, one-tenth of all the centres in England.[30] Of the forty-two, nineteen are single subject, eleven are multi-purpose, eleven are miscellaneous and one is a residential centre. This commitment to helping teachers was made by the Authority in

December, 1967.[31] At that time, it was decided to establish a network of permanent multi-purpose centres, one in each of ten geographical divisions, plus a complex of subject centres to service curriculum projects and to meet stated interests of the teachers. The English Language centres, in particular, reflected this teacher interest and were based upon the departments of large comprehensive schools. The residential centre complements the work of these centres in that it offers short term residential facilities to meet a variety of needs.

In the following presentation about the three different classifications of centres, individual and district networks are reported on in order to illustrate the wide diversity of centres.

Residential Centres

Two centres serve to illustrate this type of centre. The first is the Surrey Centre at Ewell whose establishment pre-dates that of teachers' centres in Surrey while the second is the "mobile" Cornwall Centre.

Glyn House at Ewell in Surrey is a handsomely appointed village manor home which has weathered the transformation from private residence to teacher centre. Out buildings have been converted to use as an A.V. Resource Centre while the main house has retained its character at the same time providing classrooms, meeting rooms and bedrooms. A basement kitchen and dining area complete the facilities of a centre that had ample funds for the conversion. A wide range of weekend and short term courses and meetings are held at the Centre which is within the Surrey network and, yet, outside of it because of its tradition of service to many organizations. By definition, it is a Teachers' Centre while, functionally, it is a conference centre where curriculum development may take place, but, it is

incidental to the Centre itself. The Surrey Schools Council has established a Centre of the more typical Surrey variety on the premises and this is likely to cause role redefinitions.

The geography of Cornwall determines, to some measure, its heavy dependence upon a residential centre upon which are expended approximately one-half of the district funds for teachers' centres.[32] The Centre is without a permanent facility as it rents space from hotels in this resort coastal area during the "off season." It is now in its third location, spending two years in each of two previous locations. Attendance at the Centre programs is voluntary; accommodation is provided by the Centre without charge; traveling expenses are paid and funds are available for replacement teachers. The course offerings are generally on a Monday to Friday full day basis and constitute the major effort of the Centre.

College/University Related Centres

Two types of college/university related centres are discernable. In the first type, illustrated by the centre at the University of Reading, the centre is a functional part of the higher education unit. In the second type illustrated by the centre at the Rachal McMillan College of Education, the centre is housed at the college but functions independently. The York centres are presented as contrasts to these two.

The Centre for the Teaching of Reading[33] located at the University of Reading was established in 1968 and serves almost as a national centre although it is by no means supported as one. It is located on the periphery of the campus in a converted house and it provides classroom space, meeting rooms and a permanent display of teaching of reading software and hardware. It offers curriculum

resources and ideas, short courses, published book lists, information about reading tests and arranged exhibitions. Teachers and inspectors are seconded to the Centre for a month during which they undergo intensive training in the teaching of reading as part of the short course offering. Additionally, the Centre is open to day visits by teachers in groups or singly who come from all over England.

The Rachal McMillan Teachers' Centre[34] located in the London college of education of the same name is an urban centre in the true sense. The warden carries a half-time appointment on the college staff and is assigned as a half-time centre warden. The Centre seems to have embraced a philosophy that curriculum development, let alone quality instruction, cannot occur in classrooms where the teacher and students are struggling for self-identification and the teacher may not understand many of the student problems and, in fact, may have a few of his/her own, such as housing and loneliness. The Centre operates a bar where a teacher may have a casual drink with other teachers in the area and also operates a housing bureau, not to be underestimated in the high cost, facility-short London housing market. It conducts a tutorial system for the induction of new teachers, "comfort" sessions throughout the year, in-service courses, curriculum dissemination sessions and a comprehensive A.V. Resource Centre. The warden is fully convinced that many advantages accrue to a centre located in a college of education and suggests there are five advantages:[35]

1. Full time use of the facilities as the college uses it during normal school hours and the centre takes over after that.
2. The warden as half college, half centre can better provide for program articulation.
3. The resources of the college and centre result in a far better aural and visual aids centre.

4. The Media Resources Officer as half college, half centre has immediate access to the college resources.

5. The centre is able to make full use of the college library resources.

Although it is doubtful if these reasons would be sufficient to convince very many wardens to combine with local teachers' colleges, its argument makes a great deal of sense in this urban setting. There can be no question but that both the Centre program and the College program benefit from the mutual interplay of both operations.

The City of York maintains two centres, one being the York Teachers' Centre and the other being the York Curriculum Development Centre. The former, which is, in reality, the Teachers' Centre is poorly located in a local college of education and consists of a warden and a clerical assistant. Its activities are limited to in-service courses, the demand being voiced by an advisory committee of teachers. Isolated, so to speak, from the main thrust of education in York, it suffers from a low profile. The York Curriculum Development Centre, by contrast, located in facilities provided by the University of York, seems well supported and in the swing of things locally. However, this Centre seems, in reality, to be part of the traditional organization structure of the district and its curriculum materials remain largely non-evaluated

District Non-Residential Centres

There is no question but that this third category contains the vast majority of teachers' centres that are on the front line of curriculum development. No doubt some of them such as Bury which were active in curriculum development projects have an edge over newer, more recently established centres and, consequently, are more sophisticated in their approach. By the same token, the most disoriented

and politically banished centres are found under this classification. Five centres--Bury, Enfield, Manchester, Southampton and Merthyr Tydfil are selected as being representative of the successful ones.

The Bury Teachers' Centre[36] was founded in 1967 as a curriculum centre for the Northwest Curriculum Project and became a teachers' centre by a vote of its management committee in 1970, taking the director over to the new post of warden. It is now in the process of expanding with a staff of five. Its facilities consist of quonset-type huts located on the grounds of an urban-centre school. It has an excellent resource centre and a somewhat unique position in that it served a district that did not have a curriculum staff. Its position is clearly established in the curriculum process and it provides teacher input in the local curriculum process. Its services and functions include: curriculum material evaluation groups, a wide variety of short term in-service courses, curriculum evaluation and development groups, A-V and material loan services and space for teacher groups to hold meetings. It has a management committee and staff members who seem to grasp the meaning of curriculum development and teachers' centres.

The Enfield Centre described by Kahn[37] is located in the Greater London area. Located in a converted school building, it serves an area with a population of a quarter of a million people and 112 schools. It contains a 200 seat lecture hall, a 30 seat workshop, a library-TV room, a lounge, and administrative offices; a not uncommon type of facility, although somewhat less roomy than what one expects in converted schools or school annexes. Its services and functions include: lectures on various educational topics; workshop courses; working groups of teachers on particular curriculum topics or educational developments; exhibitions; association meetings; social gatherings; resources from the library, material centre

and reprographic machine; and regular communication with teachers.

The organizational pattern of the Manchester Teacher Centre ensures it of a prominent role in the City in-service program and has enabled it to carry out a forceful role in the curriculum area.[38] Teachers and district administrative officials seem to be making an earnest effort to cooperatively look at the in-service program. The Centre is housed in two large city homes and a temporary structure on the grounds houses a reading centre. Curriculum consultants in various subject fields, subject to the authority of both the centre warden and the district inspector, carry out a curriculum dissemination effort as well as a development effort. The centre offers facilities for a wide range of activities but is short of space as one of the two buildings is given over to a most excellent curriculum and professional library, certainly the finest this researcher saw in his visits to over thirty centres. The full facilities of a teachers' club is part of the centre and the warden serves as the club secretary. It offers a full range of services including short term and regular term in-service courses. It is interesting to note that the in-service offerings of the Teachers' Centre constitutes the total in-service offering by the district.

The Portswood Curriculum Development Centre is maintained by the Southampton Educational Authority as its teachers' centre.[39] In a report issued in 1973 by the Chief Education Officer, the development of the centre is channeled into three complementary activities. First, the offering of professional in-service training with a special emphasis on technology. Second, the production of learning materials. Third, the production of specialized equipment, i.e. science tables. In addition, the Centre, similar to well organized centres elsewhere, offers a wide variety of services in quonset-type huts converted from other purposes. Curriculum evaluation/study groups do operate as an integral part of the Centre

effort and a number of well designed resource unites have been developed through Centre efforts.

Teacher involvement is real and to illustrate this point a snyopsis of a meeting held by the Secondary Advisory Panel for In-service Education on September 12, 1973, is presented below:

> In its deliberations concerning courses for secondary teachers, the Panel categorized suggestions into one of four groups as follows:
>
> "A" as being essential.
> "B as being those items which arose from or needed dealing with after the "A" group had been initiated.
> "P" as being those items which were of immediate or longer term practical needs.
>
> "GP" as being those items of current theoretical interest.

Subsequently, the recommendations were made to the district and the in-service offers were made accordingly.

The Merthyr Tydfil Centre is located in the coal mining region of south Wales. The facility is a relatively modern one-story building previously used by the civil defense authorities. It has a flexible classroom-workshop area in addition to the normal support areas. An extensive program is offered to area teachers including one-day courses, regular in-service courses, curriculum study groups divided into primary school and secondary school activities. During the 1972-73 school year, topics for the primary school included nursery education, primary mathematics, language development, child development, environmental studies, creative arts and the Welsh language. Secondary school activities for the same year included mathematics, raising of the school leaving age, sixth form, mixed ability teaching, examinations and religious education.

The organization and management are in a familiar mode except that the Centre holds a general meeting once a year at which time members are elected to the various sectional committees. Although its long term goals seem to include those activities listed under the James' report, no less than six of its twelve aims are curriculum related. In a district employing 450 teachers, over 70% participated in Centre activities during the Spring of 1973.

The examples presented in this section are representative of what one person saw and felt and may or may not be the best illustrations of the several classifications. If one were to attempt to summarize the scope and variety he might end up saying:

> "Neither a lush manor house setting nor a brilliantly contrived administrative plan doth a successful teacher centre make."

In the Years Ahead

Perhaps in no other fields is it as difficult to predict the future as it is in the field of education. There are a number of factors that inhibit accuracy, but certainly the number of children to be educated at each level is among the most difficult to pinpoint. The recent inaccuracies about the number of children in entering classes at age 5 seem to be traceable to population projections that could not anticipate the wide scale acceptance of birth control measures and the approach to zero population growth in the United States. As a result of the new population bubble failing to materialize, education entered 1972 with surplus classrooms and teachers. This is true not only in the States, but it is also part of the problem within English education. It is increasingly difficult for school officials to fund new undertakings or to even maintain the current status of funding when there are fewer school-age children and a reduced need for new teachers.

Although the teachers' centres were born during a period of teacher shortages, the James Committee which reported[41] in December of 1971 and the resultant Government White Paper [42] which was introduced to Parliament in Decembe of 1972 are of the current times--reduced school age populations, teacher surpluses and the economic doldrums. The implementation of the White Paper will affect education and, particularly, teacher education for many years to come.

The James Report and the White Paper

The report of the Committee of Inquiry into Teacher Education and Training under the chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme is the official name and source of the "James Report" as it is known. No document in recent times calls for as much change and re-orientation of teacher education in England--and, perhaps, elsewhere in the Western World--as does this report. Who were they and how did it happen are two natural questions. First, the committee consisted of eight professional educators: three school principals, two administrators in teacher education, one Her Majesty's Inspectors, one Chief Education Officer, and Lord James who is Vice-Chancellor of the University of York. The committee was called into being by Mrs. Thatcher, the then Secretary of State for Education and Science and it completed its work in approximately one year. The Committee was more of a "Capstone" to a movement than a new undertaking as other evaluative committees were active during the late 1960's and the James Committee drew heavily upon them for some of its source material. A brief summation of some of its recommendations and those of the resultant White Paper are presented in the following paragraphs.

In the report, the committee emphasized the need for what they classified as the third cycle of teacher education, essentially the continuing or in-service programs. It based this need on the fact that new methods of entrance into the

profession proposed elsewhere in the report, take time to implement and, in the meantime, we continue to educate children. Therefore, we need to work with their teachers in an effort to upgrade the quality of their education. It envisions activities covering a wide spectrum and including evening meetings, weekend conferences, courses which are degree-oriented, release for curriculum development, and for others--secondment to activities outside of teaching. Its main recommendations with respect to our concern for teachers' centres are:

1. In-service and curriculum work should be begun in the schools; staff should be increased to compensate for it; a sabbatical policy of one term every seven years; and the addition of a "professional tutor" to each school to coordinate Cycles 2 and 3 (Cycle 2 activities are related to pre-service education and Cycle 3 activities are related to in-service activities) activities within the school.

2. The establishment of a national network of "professional centres" to coordinate and provide much of the professional activity of Cycle 3 and parts of Cycle 2, to be developed from existing colleges and departments of education. Other, more widely dispersed centres could be developed from existing teachers' centres providing they could meet the professional criteria established by regional accrediting bodies.

3. Teacher education is to be a two-year cycle with the first year spent in study at the institution of higher education and the second year in the school somewhat as a practice teacher, yet as first-year probationer. This first-year probationer would be assigned one-fifth of their time to a professional centre to undertake work cooperatively developed by the school professional tutor and the staff of the professional centre.

Obviously, an undertaking of this scope has implications for change in both schools and colleges of education and the staffing of them. It calls for schools to have on their staffs persons of the calibre of a senior lecturer in Education. At the same time, college staff would be required to maintain currency in classroom teaching.

The Government White Paper is, in reality, a political paper putting forth the government's position on a particular topic, in this case--Education. It cuts

through the various reports upon which it has drawn as its basic source and presents its own position. A position which often reflects an estimate of what is politically possible rather than a document of great internal consistency.

The White Paper recommends the following main points pertaining to teachers' centres:

1. The Government accepted the concept of the sabbatical term every seven years and recommended a substantial expansion of in-service training beginning in 1974-75 so as to achieve a 3% release of teachers by 1981.

2. The Government accepted the basic concept of the induction year with probationers released for one-fifth of their time, the employment of professional tutors and the establishment of a network of professional centres. It recommended that these centres should be based principally on existing training institutions and teachers' centres.

The Department of Education and Science, by way of partial implementation issued Circular 7/73 (Appendix 5) during March, 1973. In it, the Department mandates a reduction in the number of full-time students pursuing initial teacher training from the present figure of 114,000 to 65,000 by 1981, a reduction of 49,000 students. In the meantime, it suggests that the equivalent of 15,000 student spaces will be needed in connection with the induction year and expanded in-service training.

These three documents have not gone unnoticed or unchallenged. In particular, the National Union of Teachers (43, 44, 45) has challenged the three duties assigned to the professional tutor: responsibility for in-service education, for induction and for teaching practice. Their statements seem to visualize a person with responsibility solely for induction year teachers, a situation whereby he might have as few as one teacher, as many as twelve to fifteen or more a year, or none. Obviously, this would be as unacceptable to the tutor as it would to the district

Education Committee. Thornbury[46] is concerned that the White Paper assumed that the colleges of education would take the giant share of in-service education work with teachers, leaving a bare one-third to be distributed among the remaining institutions including teachers' centres and professional centres. A paper prepared by Professors Bradley and Gardner and a subsequent report prepared by the University of Nottingham School of Education outline changes in university-school relationships necessitated by the James Report and the White Paper. Both papers emphasize the expanded role for in-service education including the professional degree program, full time courses for teachers on a one-month to one-term basis and short course activities. Flexibility of planning is a key item and it represents a major effort to change the university to meet the local needs.

The most perplexing aspect of the total situation is the attitude of the Department of Education and Science toward the teachers' colleges. This is the one segment of higher education where the Department controls student numbers and, consequently, the colleges are responsive to the Department's directives. Not only are student enrollments to be reduced by fifty per cent, but some campuses are to be closed while others are to affiliate with other institutions. If teacher supply and demand were to be the sole factors this might be reasonable even though it smacks of hindsight; but the Government has accepted in the White Paper proposals of a magnitude that dramatically affect teacher demand and the colleges of education. First, the sabbatical term every seven years will, most likely, result in a five per cent secondment figure rather than the Government estimate of three per cent. Second, the induction year will increase the demand as first year teachers will operate on a reducted time schedule. Third, the White Paper assigns a new and demanding mission on the colleges that will require the utmost skill in planning.

This is not to suggest that some of the smaller, more efficient units shouldn't close or affiliate with stronger institutions, but rather amazement that the Department should start to dismantle the very institution that it seems destined to use in order to implement the changes in teacher pre-service and in-service education.

The Professional Center

The various proposals as they relate to the Professional Centre are by far the most intriguing. A professional institution between the colleges and the school districts which provides teaching practice for the person finishing college, consultant service and orientation for the first year teacher, and in-service work for the professionally licensed teacher has long been recognized as a desirable thing. There is no question but that some of the more successful "Teachers' Centres" in the States are closer to being Professional Centres than they are Teachers' Centres in the English model. Thornbury sums it up when he says:

> ".... professional centres will need to provide a diversity of short courses, longer 'sabbatical' courses, day release for the first year teacher, consultative meetings and training for professional tutors, and support with curriculum development and resources"[47]

One easily recognizes the professional aspirations of teachers' centres in now what seems to be the institution of the 1970's. Naturally, "avant garde" teachers' centres have explored and continue to explore ways in which they may expand their activities and become professional centres and the plans and aspirations of three such centres are briefly outlined in the remaining paragraphs of this section.

The Surrey School Council and its Secretary have the matter under consideration and even though a plan has not been formally approved as yet, it is well conceptualized. The Council[48] envisions a two-tier system within the county with

the retention of all but one or two of the current teachers' centres as they are presently organized. The one or two remaining centres are to be converted to professional centres and function in somewhat the following fashion:

1. The professional tutors (six or seven) will be assigned as permanent staff to the centre.

2. The probationary year teachers will undertake their non-classroom professional growth activities at the centre when appropriate. This will constitute regular school hour use of the centre.

3. Teachers seconded to do curriculum development work will also be assigned to the professional centre and the professional tutor will work with these individuals and groups as appropriate.

4. The professional centre(s) will offer in-service courses after school hours as in the teachers' centres.

One of the advantages of this plan is that it would concentrate resources in one or two centres rather than attempting to spread it thinly overall. Further, with a staff of tutors it is natural to look to them for leadership in curriculum and, hence, the secondment of teachers to do this work in the professional centre would make sense.

The Manchester Teachers' Centre envisions[49] two types of centres: college-based and local-based and that professional tutors should have experience working in both types in order to gain as wide an experience in the training facilities as is possible. This is predicated on an assumption that colleges of education will remain as an integral part of Cycle 2 activities and that teachers' centres have a continuing role in curriculum development and classroom support. This is all the more significant in that the Manchester Teachers' Centre is clearly one of those centres which would be in the best position to assume partially the college role in Cycle 2.

The Warden of the Bury Teachers' Centre in a report of July 23, 1973, makes recommendations about expansion of that centre into a professional centre. In it he calls for the advanced professional training of a professional centre and the secondment of teachers for curriculum development work.

The Future of the Teachers' Centre

Teachers' centres grew rapidly during the 1960's; first, as a response to a need for curriculum project support and training and, second, as a response to national pressures. That burst of development is definitely over and the day-to-day task of survival seems to depend upon the leadership qualities of the warden and the professional activities of the centre. Obviously, these are interrelated, but it is difficult to determine "which is the hen and which is the egg." The professionally qualified leader tends to move onto bigger positions or he develops the centre program into one that is, in reality, a professional centre. That is not to imply that there are not high quality wardens who are conducting "good" teachers' centres; it is just that these centres are unlikely to survive the impact of the White Paper and the economic slowdown in their present form. It seems clear that centres that are not engaged in curriculum development for any number of reasons, are unlikely to become professional centres for the same reasons. The professional centres will require a high level of support and district committees are unlikely to increase their support of teachers' centres at a time they must develop professional centres. If anything, they are apt to decrease funds and gradually "starve" the teachers' centres out of existence. It seems unlikely that many of the teachers' centres will survive in their present form if the White Paper is implemented and; indeed, the rate of survival among centres may be quite low because of the need for regional accreditation.

The teachers' centre is unique in that it provides the one single means for teacher input to the curriculum outside of the negotiation room, and yet it seems doomed. Somewhat analogous to a "people's park" that has a board, its members begin to sound very much like the "Eetablishment Park Commissioners" or they fail to get the funds to make a really effective park. However, the need for professional input to the curriculum, to pre-service professional training and to in-service professional training are legitimate professional goals and new "centres" or surviving "teachers' centres" must recognize the legitimacy of the teachers' rights in this area.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Malcolm Skilbeck. "The School and Cultural Development." Northern Teacher. Winter, 1973. p. 16.

[2] Schools Council. "List of Teachers' Centres." Mimeo. London, May, 1973.

[3] In addition, the McNair Report and the Plowden Reports made reference to centres. The McNair Report (Teachers and Youth Leaders. Board of Education, 1944.) as its fourth aim recommended the setting up of a building which could be used as the educational centre of the area in which formal and informal contact could occur among those of the teaching profession. It was to offer the amenities of a club and experiment in the development of public opinion on local educational problems. The Plowden Report of 1948 (Children and Their Primary Schools, Vol. 1, HMSO) stated: Local centres are also invaluable in supporting the innovations introduced by individual teachers, the source of most educational progress. They ought to start from a knowledge of what local teachers are doing. They can provide opportunities for teachers to meet others who are a little ahead of themselves but whose practice is within their reach."

[4] Department of Education and Science. Circular. July, 1964. London, 1964.

[5] Schools Council. Raising the School Leaving Age. Working Paper, No. 2. HMSO, 1965.

[6] Department of Education and Science. Teacher Education and Training. HMSO, 1972.

[7] Department of Education and Science. Education: A Framework for Expansion. HMSO, 1972.

[8] Schools Council. Curriculum Development: Teachers' Groups and Centres. Working Paper, No. 10. London, 1967.

[9] Robert Thornbury, Editor. Teachers' Centres. Darton Longman and Todd, 1973. pp. 3-6.

[10] Schools Council. Teachers' Centres and the Changing Curriculum. Pamphlet No. 6. London, 1970, p. 8.

[11] Ibid. p. 13.

[12]This section reports the pattern in operation on March 31, 1974 and is based upon a report entitled "Crewe Teachers' Centre" by P. F. Crookall in Education in Cheshire, Autumn, 1972, personal visitation and an interview with the Schools Council Field Officer for this area.

[13]Janet Roseveare. "In-Service Education and the Teachers' Centre in a Country Area" in Teachers' Centres edited by R. E. Thornbury. Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973. pp. 131-132.

[14]Ibid. p. 137.

[15]This section reports the pattern in operation on March 31, 1974 and is based on a report entitled: Surrey Schools Council -- Who and Why?, personal visitation and an interview with the Secretary of the Council and the Field officer. For the entire report see Appendix 1.

[16]Table 1 is based upon published courses conducted by the Surrey Schools Council for the stated time periods.

[17]Taken from a report issued by the Centre in December, 1973.

[18]Bill Greenwood. "Regional Curriculum Development Through Local Teachers' Centres" in Teachers' Centres edited by R. E. Thornbury. Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973. pp. 98.

[19]Greenwood. Op. Cit. p. 110.

[20]Schools Council. Op. Cit. (No. 8).

[21]Harry Kahn. "The New Professionals" in Teachers' Centres, edited by R. E. Thornbury. Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973. p. 71.

[22]Schools Council. Op. Cit. (No. 10). p. 24.

[23]Ibid. p. 29.

[24]National Union of Teachers. Teachers' Centres: A Survey of Centre Resources and Conditions of Service of Leaders. London, 1972. pp. 23-24.

[25]Schools Council. Op. Cit. (No. 10). p. 11.

[26]Ibid. pp. 18 and 26.

[27] In the N.U.T. survey previously cited, 45 center wardens cited curriculum development as a main responsibility, exceeded only by administration of courses which was cited by 61 wardens (p. 9).

[28] Taken from a report by the Centre, 1967.

[29] Education in Cheshire. pp. 9-31.

[30] Schools Council. Op. Cit. (No. 2).

[31] Innter London Education Authority. Education Committee Minutes. December, 1967.

[32] This section is based upon a report by Janet Roseveare, Op. Cit. pp. 134-136.

[33] This section is based upon a personal visit to the Centre during October, 1973.

[34] Ibid.

[35] R. G. Gough. "Professional Support for the City Teacher" in Teachers' Centres edited by R. E. Thornbury. Darton, Longman and Todd, 1973. p. 120.

[36] This section is based upon a personal visit to the Centre during January, 1974.

[37] Harry Kahn. Op. Cit. pp. 66-87.

[38] This section is based upon a personal visit to the centre during January, 1974.

[39] Ibid.

[40] This section is based upon a personal visit to the centre during May, 1974.

[41] Department of Education and Science. Op. Cit. (No. 6).

[42] Department of Education and Science. Op. Cit. (No. 7).

[43] Alan Evans quoted in A Report of the Conference at the Margaret McMillan College of Education, November 1973. National Union of of Teachers. p. 7.

[44] National Union of Teachers Policy Statement. The Induction of New Teachers. London, 1972.

[45] National Union of Teachers. James: A Critical Appraisal. An Executive Statement. London, 1973.

[46] Robert Thornbury. Op. Cit. (No. 9). p. 145.

[47] Ibid. p. 144.

[48] Notes from an interview with the Secretary during May, 1974.

[49] Notes from an interview with the Warden during January, 1974.